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Reviewer's report:

This paper examined psychological distress and self-rated health status with pain severity in reproductive aged women from a national cross-sectional survey. I have a couple of comments about the paper:

1. It only became clear to me after reading the results session that the analyses were done separately by groups (pregnant, breastfeeding and NP/NF). This should be stated in the methods session when writing analysis plan.

2. The small sample sizes of pregnant and breastfeeding groups make the estimates of prevalence less precise (wider confidence interval). I think the authors should state this as a limit in the discussion session. On the other hand, given the small sample sizes, for the analyses of associations between health status and pain severity, I would recommend to combine "excellent" and "very good" and then combine "fair" and "poor" to make the points. Tables with actual percentages might be preferred instead of plots.

On Page 7, line 127-128, this sentence should be removed since it might not be true for pregnant and breastfeeding groups.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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